

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Assembly Journal
Eighty-Ninth Regular Session

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1990

The chief clerk makes the following entries under the above date:

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

Read and referred:

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 86-246

Relating to retraining and decertification requirements and procedures for law enforcement and jail officers.

Submitted by Law Enforcement Standards Board.

To committee on Family Law and Corrections.

Referred on May 1, 1990.

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 89-177

Relating to regulation of insurers writing health maintenance organization businesses, statutory hold-harmless provisions and individual practice associations.

Submitted by Office of the Commissioner of Insurance.

To committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Referred on May 1, 1990.

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 90-13

Relating to the homestead credit.

Submitted by Department of Revenue.

To committee on Ways and Means.

Referred on May 1, 1990.

Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 90-57

Relating to health care provider fees for the patients compensation fund and the mediation system operated by the director of the state courts for fiscal year 1990-91.

Submitted by Office of the Commissioner of Insurance.

To committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Referred on May 1, 1990.

COMMUNICATIONS

May 1, 1990

Honorable Donald J. Schneider

Honorable Thomas T. Melvin

Dear Chief Clerks:

The following rules have been published:

Clearinghouse Rule 88-23 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 88-65 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 88-201 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-17 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-64 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-95 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-119 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-143 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-152 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-157 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-158 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-170 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-174 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-178 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-185 effective 5-1-90

Clearinghouse Rule 89-205 effective 5-1-90

Sincerely,

GARY POULSON

Assistant Revisor

VETOES

The chief clerk reports the following assembly proposals vetoed by the governor on April 27:

Assembly Bill 172

Assembly Bill 211

Assembly Bill 236

Assembly Bill 287

Assembly Bill 323

Assembly Bill 464

Assembly Bill 480

Assembly Bill 521

Assembly Bill 593

Assembly Bill 622

Assembly Bill 624

Assembly Bill 681

Assembly Bill 775

Assembly Bill 840

Assembly Bill 855

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 172** in its entirety. AB 172 amends the definition of "collection agency," for purposes of regulation by the Commissioner of Banking, to include any nonstock, nonprofit corporation servicing guaranteed student loans. The practical effect of this bill would be to require one organization, Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation (GLHEC), to be licensed by the Commissioner. As a licensed collection agency, GLHEC would be required to pay annual fees, post a

performance bond, and undergo regular financial audits. I am vetoing this bill because the level of regulation this would impose is unnecessary and duplicative.

The primary function of GLHEC is to service student loans. A vast majority of the loans serviced by GLHEC are provided through the Federal Student Loan Program. As such, GLHEC is governed, supervised and audited by the federal government.

The federal Department of Education conducts regular audits of GLHEC, including studies of its collection practices as it did in response to a request by Representative Gruszynski, the author of AB 172. However, I recognize and am concerned about the allegations that GLHEC used harassment and other threatening techniques in its collection activities. The Commissioner of Banking, under the Wisconsin Consumer Act, currently has the authority to investigate complaints of harassment. I am directing the Commissioner of Banking to be responsive to those issuing complaints and to work with GLHEC to review their collection practices.

This legislation would increase the authority of the Commissioner of Banking in its regulation of GLHEC by requiring licensure and financial audits. Approval of this bill would have provided duplication of federal regulation. Therefore, I am vetoing AB 172.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 211** in its entirety. This bill establishes a mandated training level for foster parents and appropriates funds for training. It also provides for an incentive payment, of 5% on the basic foster care rate, to foster parents who complete training.

I support the idea of training for foster parents because I believe trained foster parents can be more effective. However, I am concerned about mandating training in the way provided by this bill, especially at this time of a crisis shortage in foster parents in some areas of the state. Milwaukee County, which requested a veto of this measure, has experienced a 50% increase in foster care cases in the last 2 years and is currently placing about 100 children in foster care each month. Mandating training could make the already difficult task of recruiting foster parents even harder.

I believe by providing training on a voluntary basis and providing incentives to foster parents to complete training, we can assure an increase in the pool of trained foster parents without erecting new barriers to the recruitment effort.

Because of my support for foster parent training, I am willing to consider a proposal which will assure increased training by providing incentives, rather than by mandate. I encourage those who support training to work together with those counties that are concerned about foster parent recruitment to ensure that the proposal addresses all the concerns in this important area.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 236** in its entirety. This bill expands the scope of collective bargaining to make the allocation and reallocation of individual positions to classifications and the determination of an incumbent's status resulting from reallocation mandatory subjects of collective bargaining.

I am vetoing this bill because position allocation and reallocation is a highly technical process that requires consistency on a statewide basis. Determining classifications of individual positions through collective bargaining as required by AB 236 would undermine the objectivity of the current classification system. A position's classification must be determined based on the duties and responsibilities of that position, not on the negotiating skills and varying demands of particular bargaining units.

In addition, the state's ability to react in a timely manner to changing staffing needs would be severely hampered if a union agreement was necessary prior to allocating individual positions to classifications.

The belief that this bill would improve state employment relations by means of bargaining is ill-founded. Mandating the subjects of individual position classification actions, promotions, and the allocation and reallocation of positions will not contribute to a more efficient collective bargaining process. These subjects relate to issues of how agencies are staffed, and the types of positions necessary for that staffing. These are management decisions that should not be forced to be subject to the sometimes lengthy bargaining process.

Particularly after the enactment last session of 1987 Act 331, union concerns related to the traditional subject of bargaining of wages, hours and conditions of employment are sufficiently protected. Act 331 made the wage impacts of classification decisions bargainable. This Act has on its own significantly complicated bargaining, lengthening the process due to the difficult nature of the subject. Adding the additional mandatory subjects of classifications and reclassifications will only further complicate bargaining, only creating the potential for further and more significant delays, and will

further burden the ability of state management to act in a timely fashion.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 287** in its entirety. This bill would require the state to bargain collectively concerning rectification of salary range inequities resulting from reclassifications or promotions and concerning the use of project or limited term employees (LTE), to perform work which would otherwise be performed by employees in a collective bargaining unit.

I am vetoing **AB 287** because collective bargaining of the state's right to use LTE and project positions will restrict the state's flexibility to efficiently manage its personnel resources.

As with my veto of **Assembly Bill 236**, I believe that mandating these subjects will not contribute to a more efficient collective bargaining process. 1987 Act 331 made the wage impacts of classification issues a bargainable subject. This alone has served to greatly complicate and extend the bargaining process. Adding further subjects at this time is not likely to help reduce the duration of bargaining. And, in addition, I do not believe that the management of state government will be improved by the reduction in management's ability to respond quickly to changing personnel needs. Under the bill, bargaining could become a perpetual process since issues involving salary inequities and the use of LTEs and project employees arise on a continual basis.

For these reasons, I am not approving this bill.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have vetoed **Assembly Bill 323** in its entirety. **Assembly Bill 323** would amend Chapter 134 of the statutes to prohibit the sending of advertisements using a facsimile machine. However, the prohibition would go into effect only if the receiving party notifies the sender, in writing or by facsimile message, that the solicitations are not desired.

A similar provision is included in **Senate Bill 542**. However, the language in **SB 542** further specifies that

prior to receiving notification to cease transmission of advertisements, facsimile solicitations may be no longer than one page, must be sent between 9 pm and 6 am, and that the recipient and sender must have had a prior business relationship.

I have vetoed **Assembly Bill 323** and will retain the broader prohibitions on advertisements sent by facsimile machine in **Senate Bill 542**. I believe the latter version provides a more thorough regulation of this type of communication, but still allows firms adequate opportunities to use facsimile machines to transmit information to potential customers.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 464** in its entirety due to administrative problems which will arise from inserting a new definition of "severely disabled employe" into the state statutes.

Currently, there are two definitions of "handicapped" which affect state policies concerning persons with disabilities. (It should be noted that, since these laws were written, "disabled individuals" or "persons with a disability" has become the preferred term.)

The **State Fair Employment Act** (s. 11.32) defines "handicapped individual" as one who a) has a physical or mental impairment which makes achievement unusually difficult or limits capacity to work; b) has a record of having such an impairment; or c) is perceived as having such an impairment. A second definition of "handicapped" is found in the **Federal Rehabilitation Act** (section 504). Under this Act, a person is "handicapped" if he or she: 1) has a mental or physical impairment which substantially limits one or more of such person's major life activities; 2) has a record of such impairment; or 3) is regarded as having such an impairment.

Adding yet a third definition for "severely disabled employe" in the state statutes will be both confusing and administratively cumbersome. In addition, it should be noted that this new definition will be used for reporting purposes only and will not necessarily result in focusing the delivery of services toward the more severely disabled.

While the intent of the advocacy groups and legislators supporting this legislation is admirable, their desire to not only identify but also assist individuals with more severe disabilities in the state's current and potential workforce can be accomplished in another manner. I am directing the **Division of Affirmative Action** and the

Division of Merit Recruitment and Selection, both within the Department of Employment Relations (DER), with the assistance of the Department of Administration to undertake a study of individuals with severe disabilities currently in state employment, using the definition in this bill as a guide. Such a study could be coordinated with the self-identification and needs assessment survey of employes with disabilities which every state agency is required to initiate every two years under the state's Affirmative Action standards. My goal is to improve our ability to track persons with varying levels of disabilities throughout the personnel process.

This approach offers a better solution to the concerns raised by advocates of this bill, because it is not limited to numbers gathering but also provides practical steps to enhance disabled hiring and workplace productivity.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing Assembly Bill 480 in its entirety. Assembly Bill 480 amends state law relating to requirements for receiving an automatic joint survivor death benefit. Current law provides that if an active participant dies after age 60 (age 55 for protective occupations) their survivor is eligible for an annuity based on what the participant would have received had he or she retired at the time of death. Assembly Bill 480 reduces the age requirement to 55 year for general employes and 50 for protective occupations.

AB 480 aligns survivor benefits with the temporary early retirement ages of 50 and 55 instead of the permanent ages of 55 and 57. While I understand that the current age requirements cause an inequity, referred to as a benefit cliff, in the calculation of survivor benefits, AB 480 does not address this problem. Additionally the actuarial cost of AB 480 make the provision unacceptable. It is estimated by the Joint Survey Committee on Retirement Systems that this provision would create a \$4.2 million local mandated cost, in addition to increased state costs. Wisconsin provides excellent benefits to public employee and the state and local governments must pay for most of those benefits. I would support a provision that truly addresses the survivor benefit cliff with funding from within the system.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have vetoed Assembly Bill 521 in its entirety. Assembly Bill 521 amended Chapter 40 of the statutes to allow former state employes, who are receiving a Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) annuity of have 20 years of state employment service, the opportunity to enroll in the state group health plan. Under the provisions created in the bill, the former employe must submit evidence of insurability and must pay all premiums.

Health care costs for the state, as well as society at large, are continuing to grow. Wisconsin state government has made great strides to keep health care costs in line. I have vetoed Assembly Bill 521, because it may in the long run serve to erode our efforts in this area. In order to maintain control of health care costs, and in turn limit the taxpayer dollars paying for those costs, we must be vigilant in ensuring that expansion of health care services is well planned and will not unintentionally increase costs. I do not believe that Assembly Bill 521 received that type of scrutiny.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing Assembly Bill 593 in its entirety. Assembly Bill 593 provides \$40,000 GPR annually, beginning in 1989-90 and ending June 30, 1993 to support University of Wisconsin studies of the white-tailed deer population and predators including black bear, coyotes and bobcats in northern Wisconsin.

I am vetoing the bill because the UW budget contains a large research base from which it can support priority research such as this study. If existing funding is inadequate, the UW could include this study in its next budget submittal.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing Assembly Bill 622 in its entirety because I believe this bill will weaken the effectiveness of the child abuse reporting law. This law was created to ensure the safety of Wisconsin's children. I want to be very sure

that any changes to this law serve only to further protect those children.

Current law provides that adults in positions of authority are required to report discovered sexual activity by children as child abuse under the belief that such activity is very likely to be the result of child abuse, incest or rape. Current law also provides that certain persons who provide family planning services, pregnancy testing, obstetrical care, and services for the treatment or diagnosis of sexually transmitted disease are not required to report, as abuse, cases of sexual contact or sexual activity involving a child.

This bill expands the reporting exceptions to include persons who provide reproductive health care services, persons who provide pupil services such as counseling, psychological services, social work or nursing, and persons who refer children to a health care provider or pupil service provider. I believe this is far too expansive.

I could support expanding this reporting exception to school teachers who have, through their daily contact with a child, established an ongoing relationship with that child and possibly also with that child's parents. I am not at all confident that the broad range of new exceptions provided by this bill need be made, exceptions which potentially erode further the importance of parents in instilling values in their own children, and eroding too the value of parents as the major source of support and care for their children.

I am also concerned about the lack of a lower age limit for children who are to be excluded from the reporting requirement. As I indicated in an earlier veto message, I believe that the language should contain guidelines regarding age disparities between the parties engaged in the sexual activity. A question could be raised whether true consensual activity is possible between an adult and a young child. For example, the fact that a 9 year-old is found to be sexually active argues strongly that abuse in some form is indeed taking place. In a case such as this there can be no exception to the reporting requirement.

I encourage legislators to work with me to address these concerns.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 624** in its entirety. This bill provides state GPR funding to a private provider to conduct family health care benefits counseling in a few selected counties. These programs have been previously supported by grants from the federal government.

I am aware that some low income individuals may at times be bewildered in their dealings with the health care system and that the concept of providing health care benefits counseling has some merit. Nevertheless, at this time, I am vetoing this bill for the following reasons. A variety of resources already exist to disseminate the type of services envisioned by this legislation, such as outreach and counseling by local public health agencies and the Department of Health and Social Services pregnancy outreach program. I am also concerned about the fiscal situation created by the passage of SB 542 and the large number of other bills with significant fiscal impacts. Further, the enhanced services provided by this bill are limited to a few counties, and I see no compelling state interest in funding family health benefits counseling in only nine counties. Finally, the use of state funds to replace federal funding is inappropriate. I have previously vetoed this item in 1989 Act 31 for the same reasons, and this veto is consistent with that action.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 681** in its entirety. This bill eliminates the testing requirement of the P-5 program and replaces it with an evaluation requirement under which each P-5 school would be able to develop, jointly with the school board and their State Superintendent, its own evaluation method.

This bill contains provisions which are nearly identical to provisions I vetoed in Act 31. While I understand that part of the current testing required under the P-5 program might not be entirely relevant to the P-5 program, I feel that it is important to maintain a strong testing component of the programs as a means by which the effectiveness of the program can be evaluated. It would be particularly unwise to eliminate the testing requirement in light of the recent legislation which makes schools in all areas of the state eligible for P-5 grants. Testing is also essential since state statutes require that grants be provided on the basis of improvement in student performance.

I would thus encourage the State Superintendent to use the existing authority, regarding approval of the tests used in the P-5 program, to ensure that the testing is as relevant as possible. I would also encourage the State Superintendent, the P-5 Council and local school districts to develop legislation which would modify

existing statutes to ensure that P-5 testing is relevant without eliminating the testing component altogether.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 775** because it creates a special registration plate for anyone with first responder training, whether or not that individual practices in cooperation with local Emergency Medical Services.

Most first responders in our rural areas operate under the auspices of a fire department, EMS district or other governmental unit. Unfortunately, this bill does not restrict the issuance of special plates to those individuals. There are situations and communities where the responsibility of first responders is not yet clearly defined. If the state issues a registration plate to all first responders, it may only serve to aggravate or confuse an already difficult situation.

I also want to take this opportunity to express a growing concern with the seemingly unlimited proliferation of special license plates. Attempts have been made by the Department of Transportation and the Legislature to provide for some uniformity of design. Yet even with this attempted uniformity, there is still considerable potential for confusion in viewing these plates, particularly in emergencies. After all, the first purpose for a license plate is to identify the vehicle and its owner. To allow a variety of styles, colors, lettering and logos greatly increases the chances of misidentification. I am therefore directing the Department of Transportation to conduct an analysis of the costs and enforcement implications of the continued proliferation of specialized license plates. The results of this analysis should be provided to me no later than January 1, 1991.

My veto of this bill in no way reflects poorly on first responders or their training. I have already signed a bill authorizing a special plate for Emergency Medical Technicians, to illustrate my support for these services. First responders also provide an invaluable service in many rural areas where ambulance response times are longer than urban areas.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing **Assembly Bill 840** in its entirety. The bill mandates the creation of a system of minimum and maximum compensation levels for nonrepresented state-employed teacher supervisors. The bill will thereby place the determination of represented state teacher salaries outside of the scope of collective bargaining, thoroughly disrupting the collective bargaining process between the State of Wisconsin and the labor organization representing teachers in state service.

During the last biennium I signed into law Wisconsin Act 331, substantially expanding the scope of collective bargaining to make the assignments and reassignments of classifications to pay ranges a mandatory subject of bargaining. AB 840 contradicts and is in violation of the spirit and intent of Act 331, subverting the ability of the parties to negotiate a mutually agreeable contract. By creating a formula driven salary structure no allowance is made for the differences between agreements at the state and the local level in areas such as fringe benefits, seniority and other bargaining-related items.

I have stated in the past that teacher salaries need to be competitive with those salaries paid in the state's public school districts. The tentative agreement that has just been reached with the teachers' representatives will accomplish this end. On June 14, 1988 I directed the Department of Employment Relations to survey state teachers and compare their compensation to that of local school teachers. The results of that survey are the basis for the tentative agreement bargained with the teachers and the agreement successfully addresses the major concerns identified by that survey.

The parties to this tentative agreement have been able to bargain freely to improve teacher salaries and benefit in a manner satisfactory to both sides. Non-represented supervisors will also see additional adjustments on their behalf to the non-represented pay plan as a result of the expected ratification and enactment of this agreement.

The collective bargaining process is the appropriate forum for the establishment of teachers' salaries. AB 840 would arbitrarily interfere with this process, removing the flexibility now enjoyed by both the employer and the employee.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [May 2, 1990]

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1990

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I am vetoing Assembly Bill 855 in its entirety. This bill modifies the criteria identifying which school districts are required to have DPI approve their educational programs for children-at-risk and the criteria for receiving state aid. Assembly Bill 855 uses high school graduation rates instead of dropout rates to identify school districts.

According to proponents of the bill, its intent is to offset an expected decline in the number of districts meeting the dropout rate criteria due to other legislative changes and not to increase the current number of districts eligible for children-at-risk aid. I am vetoing this bill because, contrary to the proponents' view, it could substantially increase the number of participating districts, and, therefore, the cost of children-at-risk aid.

Under current law, 16 of Wisconsin's 430 school districts had approved children-at-risk plans in 1988-89. These districts received a total of \$1.3 million in children-at-risk aid. Assembly Bill 855 would make every district with a graduation rate below 85% eligible for aid. Federal data indicates that Wisconsin's average graduation rate is 85%. This means that the number of school districts eligible for aid under Assembly Bill 855 could increase substantially, and result in a shift in the distribution of aid.

I am not opposed to modifying eligibility criteria for children-at-risk aid. I believe it is important that districts currently receiving this aid be held harmless from legislative changes that are not directly related to a reduction in the number of children-at-risk. However, changes in eligibility criteria must be accompanied by an accurate estimate of their fiscal and programmatic impact to ensure that the scope of the children-at-risk program is not significantly altered.

Respectfully submitted,
TOMMY G. THOMPSON
Governor

COMMUNICATIONS

State of Wisconsin
Department of State
Madison

To Whom It May Concern:

Acts, joint resolutions and resolutions, deposited in this office, have been numbered and published as follows:

Bill or Res. No.	Act No.	Publication date
Assembly Bill 282-----	238 -----	April 30, 1990
Assembly Bill 349-----	239 -----	April 30, 1990
Assembly Bill 382-----	240 -----	April 30, 1990

Assembly Bill 634-----	241 -----	April 30, 1990
Assembly Bill 849-----	242 -----	April 30, 1990
Assembly Bill 220-----	243 -----	May 1, 1990
Assembly Bill 496-----	244 -----	May 1, 1990
Assembly Bill 598-----	245 -----	May 1, 1990
Assembly Bill 711-----	246 -----	May 1, 1990
Assembly Bill 895-----	247 -----	May 1, 1990
Assembly Bill 274-----	254 -----	May 2, 1990
Assembly Bill 275-----	255 -----	May 2, 1990
Assembly Bill 237-----	256 -----	May 2, 1990

Sincerely,
DOUGLAS La FOLLETTE
Secretary of State

April 25, 1990

The Honorable Tom Loftus, Speaker
Wisconsin State Assembly
Room 211 West, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702

Dear Speaker Loftus:

As you are aware, Representative Joe Tregoning has resigned from the State Assembly as of Monday, May 28, 1990. We will miss him a great deal.

Representative Tregoning's resignation creates an opening on the Transportation Projects Commission. It is my pleasure to appoint Representative David Brandemuehl to this commission.

My intent is that Representative Brandemuehl's appointment be effective as soon as Representative Tregoning leaves the commission.

Sincerely,
DAVID PROSSER, JR.
Minority Leader

March 20, 1990

Thomas Melvin
Assembly Chief Clerk
Suite 402, I East Main St.
Madison, WI 53702

Dear Mr. Melvin:

Enclosed you will find a copy of the "State Laboratories Consolidation Study" recently completed by the Department of Administration.

1989 Wisconsin Act 31 contains language directing the Department to determine whether a consolidation of state-operated laboratories would permit greater financial and management efficiency.

Although Act 31 sets a deadline of October 1, 1990 for completion of the study, we accelerated the schedule in order to coordinate with Division of Facilities

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [May 2, 1990]

Management planning efforts concerning a requested new facility for the State Laboratory of Hygiene.

The report is also being sent to the Governor and the Chief Clerk of the Senate for distribution to the appropriate standing committees.

If you have any questions concerning the report, please contact Marty Olle in the State Budget Office at 266-2843.

**Sincerely,
JAMES R. KLAUSER
Secretary, DOA**